



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,789	09/15/2003	Thomas E. Chefalas	YOR920010714US1	9514
35526	7590	07/20/2009		
DUKE W. YEE YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C. P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			EXAMINER VEILLARD, JACQUES	
			ART UNIT 2165	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 07/20/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptonotifs@yeeiplaw.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/662,789	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CHEFALAS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> JACQUES VEILLARD	<b>Art Unit</b> 2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-7,10,14-17,19 and 21-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5,6,7,10,14-17,19, 21-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to the Applicant's communication filed on 4/07/2009.
2. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 10, 14, 15, 17, 19, 21, 22 amended, and claims 2, 4, 8, 9, 11-13, 18, 20, 24, 25 have been canceled.
3. Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 10, 14-17, 19, 21-23 pending and presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

4. Applicant's amendment filed April 07, 2009, overcomes the rejection of claims 1, 3-7, and 10, 14-16 under 35 USC § 101 set forth in the previous office action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 10, 14-17, 19, and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 6,185,574) in view of Lewak et al. U. S. Pat. No. 5,544,360).

As per claims 1, 10, and 17, Howard et al. disclose a system, which including data processing system for locating files in a hierarchical directories as detailed in

Art Unit: 2165

col.10, lines 10-12, col.12, lines 27-34, col.12, line 66 through col.14, line 6). In particular, Howard et al. disclose the claimed limitations wherein an input has been received indicating that a given file is to be saved (See Howard et al. Fig.15 in conjunction with steps 754 and 758, col.31, lines 18-23). Howard et al. specifically disclose that a user can retrieve a file where the file is saved as detailed in col.4, lines 55-57, col.12, and lines 16-27); receiving a request from a requester for files associated with the unique identifier, wherein the files are part of a commonly related set of files(e.g., a user made a request to access a file)as detailed (See Howard et al. col. 16, line 31); responsive to the request, querying the data store for an identification of the files associated with the unique identifier( e.g., a file is returned in response to the file open command) as detailed (See Howard et al. col.16, lines 32-34); receiving a result from the data store, wherein the result is resented as a list containing the files associated with the unique identifier(See Howard et al. Fig.17); returning the result to the requester; receiving a selection of a particular file from the result from the requester( ); and responsive to the selection of the particular file, returning the particular file to an appropriate application, wherein the requester accesses the file in the appropriate application, wherein the application is located on the data processing system as detailed(See Howard et al. col.16, lines 34-45).

It is noted, however, Howard et al. did not specifically disclose the system for saving the given file in association with a unique identifier in a data store, responsive to receiving an input, wherein the data store describes associations between the files, wherein the unique identifier is used to retrieve the given file, and wherein unique

Art Unit: 2165

identifier is separated from a title and contents of the given file. On the other hand, Lewak et al. disclose a method for accessing computer files and data using linked categories (See Lewak et al. (Title, the abstract, col.3, line 66 through col. 4, line 4). The system capable of saving a given file in association with a unique identifier in a data store (See Lewak et al.col.6, lines 12-20), responsive to receiving an input, wherein the data store describes associations between the files(See Lewak et al. Fig.3, col.5, line 32 through col.6, line 22), wherein the unique identifier is used to retrieve the given file, and wherein unique identifier is separated from a title and contents of the given file (See Lewak et al. col.11, lines 54-56; col.12, lines 43-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to modify the parallel virtual directory system of Howard et al. by incorporating the method for accessing computer files and data, using linked categories assigned to each data file record on entry of the data file record because that would have enhanced the system of Howard et al. by allowing it to retrieve files or documents store in data store when a request to access to a file that they have selected from the virtual directory quickly and efficiently using the unique identifier categorization taught by Lewak et al. wherein each category file description is associated with a unique identifier permitting to return the result appropriately in response to a request for a given file.

As per claims 3, and 19, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, and 17. Applicant attention is directed to the rejection of

Art Unit: 2165

claims 1, 17 above. In addition, the combination of Howard et al. and Lewak et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations, wherein the unique identifier is associated with a variety of file extension for the common related set of files (See Lewak et al. col.6, lines 44-56, col.12, lines 43-61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to modify the parallel virtual directory system of Howard et al. by incorporating the method for accessing computer files and data, using linked categories assigned to each data file record on entry of the data file record because that would have enhanced the system of Howard et al. by allowing it to retrieve files or documents store in data store when a request to access to a file that they have selected from the virtual directory quickly and efficiently using the unique identifier categorization taught by Lewak et al. wherein each category file description is associated with a unique identifier permitting to return the result appropriately in response to a request for a given file.

As per claims 5, 14, and 21, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 10, and 17. Applicant attention is directed to the rejection of claims 1, 10, and 17 above. In addition, the combination of Howard et al. and Lewak et al, as modified, discloses the claimed limitations, wherein input is a user input to save the file (See Howard et al. col.31, lines 18-23).

As per claims 6, 15, and 22, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 10, and 17. Applicant attention is directed to the

Art Unit: 2165

rejection of claims 1, 10, and 17 above. In addition, the combination of Howard et al. and Lewak et al, as modified, discloses the claimed limitations, wherein the unique identifier is numeric value associated with the files (See Lewak et al. col.9, lines 36-41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to modify the parallel virtual directory system of Howard et al. by incorporating the method for accessing computer files and data, using linked categories assigned to each data file record on entry of the data file record because that would have enhanced the system of Howard et al. by allowing it to retrieve files or documents store in data store when a request to access to a file that they have selected from the virtual directory quickly and efficiently using the unique identifier categorization taught by Lewak et al. wherein each category file description is associated with a unique identifier permitting to return the result appropriately in response to a request for a given file.

As per claims 7, 16, and 23, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 10, and 17. Applicant attention is directed to the rejection of claims 1, 10, and 17 above. In addition, the combination of Howard et al. and Lewak et al, as modified, discloses the claimed limitations, wherein the identifier is selected from one of a user name, an event, or a task (See Howard et al. col.4, lines 50-54, col.15, lines 18-23).

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 5-7, 10, 14-17, 19, 21-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

***Other Prior Art Made Of Record***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. U.S. patents and U.S. patent application publications will not be supplied with Office actions. Examiners advise the Applicant that the cited U.S. patents and patent application publications are available for download via the Office's PAIR. As an alternate source, all U.S. patents and patent application publications are available on the USPTO web site ([www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)), from the Office of Public Records and from



Art Unit: 2165

commercial sources. For the use of the Office's PAIR system, Applicants may refer to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at <http://www.uspto.gov/ebc/index.html> or 1-866-  
217-9197

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JACQUES VEILLARD whose telephone number is (571)272-4086. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. to Fri. from 9 AM to 4:30 PM, alt. Fri. off..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Neveen Abel-Jalil can be reached on (571) 272- 4074. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. V. /

Examiner, Art Unit 2165

Application/Control Number: 10/662,789

Page 9

Art Unit: 2165

July 14, 2009

/Neveen Abel-Jalil/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165